KPMG Consulting

P U B L I C S E R V I C E S

FYDP Improvement Focus Area

Data Comparison Across PPBS

Overview

KPMG Consulting

PUBLIC SERVICES

- **The purpose of this brief is to review PPBS Improvement issues related to Data Comparison Across PPBS**

- **The following areas will be addressed:**

  - Problem Statement
  - Problem Description/Examples
  - Root Cause
  - Questions
  - Potential Solutions

Problem Statement

KPMG Consulting

PUBLIC SERVICES

- **Data is difficult to compare across phases of the PPBS process. Although much of the same data is used across the three phases of PPBS, there is an inability to easily track common data from one phase to the next.**

Problem Description/Examples

- **Line item changes made to data during the budgeting phase (e.g., marks) are not always accurately allocated to PEs. This causes difficulties in comparing Programming data to Budgeting data.**

- **The use of different data elements between programming, budgeting, and execution phases prevents analysts from fully benefiting from the other phase's work. For instance, this disconnect prevents programmers from potentially learning from the execution of previous years budgets because there is no direct match-up of programming codes with budget and execution codes.**

- **With regards to inconsistent data naming, PE equates to line item within the RDT&E appropriation. Thus the same data has two different names. For all other appropriations PE does not equate to line item. The context in which PE is used determines its meaning.**

Root Cause

- **The dynamic and complex environment of the DON PPBS process**
  - Vast number of stakeholders
  - Ever-evolving defense priorities
- **Insufficient coordination of phases across the PPBS process**
  - Disconnect between PEs and Line Items
  - Lack of data element standardization
  - Incompatible data allowed grows unchecked, becoming increasingly difficult to leverage
- **Inadequate attention to detail.**
  - Insufficiently descriptive issue titles
  - Not enough performance measures

Potential Solutions

- **Benchmark against other services to see how they handle the PE – Line Item disconnect.**
- **Implement standards for content of issue descriptions.**
- **Develop To-Be process model for concurrent Programming and Budgeting processes, with an emphasis on achieving synergies to reduce their complexity.**
- **Establish steering group for corporate information system management and data element standardization across the PPBS process.**

Interview Questions

KPMG Consulting

PUBLIC SERVICES

- What is the best way to resolve the PE – Line Item disconnect?
- What are the most common omissions from issue descriptions?
- How would concurrent Programming and Budgeting affect your process?
- What are the most pressing data compatibility problems at the moment?
- Which data should/should not be off-limits to corporate management?
- How can the current PE restructuring effort best be advised to solve the PE – LI disconnect problem?
- How has data incompatibility adversely affected the DoN at the OSD and Congressional levels?
- Who (externally) relies on PE data? On LI data? On both?
- Why is there such violent disagreement on the validity of PEs between programmers and budgeters?
- Is a one-to-one relationship between PEs and LIs desirable, feasible, and useful?